

REMARKS

The specification has been amended to correct an obvious error in a drawing designation. FIG. 46, FIG. 47 and FIG. 48 are all shown as related to the FIG. 38-FIG. 48 embodiment.

Claim 24 has been amended to present it in independent form. Claims 24, 25 and new Claim 33 should, as a result, be in allowable form.

Claim 17 has been cancelled. Claim 18 has been written in independent form. New Claim 34, depending from Claim 18, has been added.


Claims 18, 19 and 30-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Anderson in view of Work et al (1534). For the reasons hereinafter discussed, applicant submits that this rejection is not supportable and should be withdrawn.

First, Anderson does not disclose a single lumen catheter tube 16. The element 16 is a stylet receiving, "linking" means. It is not a catheter tube for delivering or aspirating fluid. The single lumen tube does not contain a "port" on the end of the single lumen tube or the second bolus.

Second, Work et al does not show or suggest a second bolus on a single lumen tube which extends from the first bolus. As such, the combination defined by Claims 18 and 32 can find no suggestion in the prior art.

Applicant submits that the only claims remaining in the application, Claims 18, 19, 24, 25 and 30-34 should be in allowable form. Passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Richard G. Lione
Registration No. 19,795
Attorney for Applicant(s)

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200